



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/21/3266868

1 Hunters Cottage, Pogmoor Lane, Barnsley S75 2JS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Sykes against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0697, dated 1 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a garage outbuilding to side garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (the LP) requires that, amongst other matters, new development respects the local character of the area. 'Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations' (the SPD), with regards outbuildings and annexes, specifically refers to detached garages and requires that they "relate sympathetically to the main dwelling in style, proportions and external finishes" and, with regards eaves height, should not normally exceed 2.5m.
4. The submitted plans show that the proposed outbuilding would be some 5 meters deep and over 10 meters wide, incorporating a large garage door and separate room.
5. I note that in the course of the determination of the application as a result of discussions between the appellant and the Council, the submitted plans have been amended to incorporate a pitched roof matching the existing dwelling and the other outbuilding on the appeal site. The Officer's report details that the "eaves and ridge height of 2.85m and 3.54m respectively".
6. The Council details that the proposed building is not deep enough to function as a garage. I have not been provided with a copy of the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide (SYRDG) I understand that this document details a recommended depth for garages, being 6m or 5.5m where a roller shutter door is utilised. Other than querying how the building can be argued, by the Council,

to be large enough to be a dwelling and also too small to be a garage, the appellant does not make comment on the functionality of the garage.

7. The appeal site is located at the end of a quiet residential street with open fields beyond. Nonetheless I saw at the site visit that the proposed outbuilding would be visible from a number of public viewpoints, in addition to neighbouring properties.
8. As a result of the location, notable size and scale of the proposed garage outbuilding in itself and in proportion to the dwelling on the appeal site I find that the appeal scheme would appear as an incongruous feature, harming the character and appearance of the local area. Thus the appeal scheme is contrary to the provisions of Policy DP1 of the LP and the guidance set out in the SPD.

Other Matters

9. The decision notice details that the proposed outbuilding, being of such a size, could be used as a standalone dwellinghouse. Additionally, the decision notice also refers to the potential use of the outbuilding for commercial use. I note that this is not what has been applied for and presumably planning permission would be required for such alternative uses.
10. The appellant details that the materials, a combination of render and stone would match the original property, and that the roof would be constructed to include sedum to be more environmentally friendly. These are material considerations that weigh in favour of the proposal but do not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR